Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 318 Case file # 95-272708 .

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial, transcript not available.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 10:15 AM (Time), 03/16/2001 (Date)

File #: 95-272708

Laboratory #(s): 60516054

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
TR, QX	☐	X		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 60516054 Date: Aug 22, 1986

Laboratory Number: Date:

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 60516054

Initials:

CRM - 5993

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter (dated 5-8-86)

Results of Review

File #: 95-272708 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q9, Q18-Q20A, Q22, Q29, Q31, Q38, Q41, K1, K2, K5, K6, K8

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available **at the time of the original examination(s)**?
☐ Yes ☐ No X ☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: SMA

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-272708

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, even with the best notes, there is no way to determine the comparison was performed correctly. A confirmation of the hair matches was apparently obtained from a second examiner.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. RQ uses abbreviations to indicate the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret.

Malone's bench notes indicate that Negroid hair was recovered from Q9 (sheet), Q18 (sheet), Q19 (coat), Q20A (debris from body), Q22 (rug) and Q38 (carpet). The presence of these hairs, foreign to the Caucasian victims and suspect, was not reported.

Review completed at: 10:45 AM (Time), 03/16/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:30 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Robinson — 03/16/2001

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SR